

OTOE COUNTY THREE YEAR COMPREHENSIVE JUVENILE SERVICES PLAN

January 1, 2009 to December 31, 2011

Contact Information:

RECEIVED

Project Planning Director:

Jacki Schmitz
People United for Families
American National Bank
Box 730, 920 Central Avenue
Nebraska City, NE 68410

Phone: (402) 873-6343; Fax: (402) 873-6345

Email: puffnc@alltel.net

DEC 29 2008

NEBRASKA COMMISSION ON
LAW ENFORCEMENT AND
CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Community Coalition Chair:

Shawwna Silvius
Partners for Otoe County
906 1st Avenue
Nebraska City, NE 68410
Phone: (402) 209-0559
Email: leadershipnc@windstream.net

County Board Chair:

Joy Schroder
347 N. 4th Road
Palmyra, NE 68418
Phone: (402) 780-5842; Fax: (402) 873-9506

Fiscal Officer:

Janene Bennett
Otoe County Clerk
Otoe County Courthouse, Box 249
Nebraska City, NE 68410
Phone: (402) 873-9501; Fax (402) 873-9506
Email: soscou11@nol.org

II. Community Team:

Partners for Otoe County (P4OC) is the community team involved in the Comprehensive Juvenile Service Planning for Otoe County. The Otoe County Coalition for Children, Youth and Families was established in 2001 when the original Otoe County Comprehensive Juvenile Service Plan was being developed. In August of 2007, the Otoe County Coalition for Children, Youth and Families and the Nebraska City Healthy Communities Coalition merged to form a single coalition known as Partners for Otoe County.

Partners for Otoe County has three fiscal agents – Otoe County, People United For Families and St. Mary's Community Hospital – who work in conjunction with each other and members of the coalition to do community needs assessment, capacity building, planning, implementation, sustainability and evaluation activities that bring about a healthy Otoe County community. Partners for Otoe County is open to everyone who is a citizen or representative of the Otoe County community. The full Partners for Otoe County Coalition meets approximately twice per year to establish goals and priorities and to report progress to the community. A Coordinating Committee meets 10 times per year to provide leadership, coordination and accountability for P4OC. The Coordinating Committee has one representative from each of the community sectors designated below, plus one representative for each fiscal agent as follows:

1. Business Community – Shawna Silvius, River County Economic Development
2. Civic/Volunteer Groups – Rhae Werner, American Red Cross
3. Diversity – Soledad Peterson, Nebraska City Public Schools
4. Healthcare Professionals – Kay Kiechel, St. Mary's Community Hospital
5. Law Enforcement – Tim Noerrlinger, Deputy County Attorney
6. Media – Kathy Davenport, KNCY Radio
7. Parents – Dotti Easter, Lourdes Central Catholic Schools
8. Religious Organizations – Brenda Pfeifly, Beautiful Savior Lutheran Church
9. Schools – Don Loseke, Nebraska City Public Schools
10. State/Local Government Agencies – Kay Oestmann, SE District Health Department
11. Youth – Tyler Wellman – Syracuse-Dunbar-Avoca Schools
12. Youth Serving Organizations – Mandy Volkmer, Behavioral Health Solutions
13. Fiscal Agent – Dale Haverty, Otoe County Board of Commissioners
14. Fiscal Agent – Sarah Purcell, People United For Families
15. Fiscal Agent – Tammi Thompson, St. Mary's Community Hospital

Partners for Otoe County also has standing committees formed on the basis of identified community needs. The groups act on the recommendations/ideas brought forth by the full coalition, put those ideas into motion, share ideas and progress, gather information regarding results, and feed it back to the community. Current standing committees are:

1. Healthy Families
2. Healthy Youth
3. Marketing Committee
4. Basic Needs Committee
5. Leadership Committee
6. PACT Community Action Committee on Underage Drinking

The Healthy Youth Committee has primary responsibility for developing and implementing Otoe County's Comprehensive Juvenile Service Plan. The Healthy Youth Committee meets every one to three months, depending on the workload of the committee. Members of the committee contributing to the development of the Comprehensive Juvenile Service Plan include:

Name	Role	Address	Phone	Email
Vanessa Sherman	Otoe County Juvenile Diversion Coordinator	Box 730, 920 Central Nebraska City 68410	873-6343	pu40821@alltel.net
Tim Noerrlinger	Deputy Otoe County Attorney	115 N. 10 th Street Nebraska City 68410	873-9044	tnoerrlinger@yahoo.com
Amanda Davis	Drug Free Comm. Coord. People United For Families	320 5 th Street, St. 201 Syracuse, NE 68447	269-3166	Ajdavis326@alltel.net
Christy Merryman	Guidance Counselor Palmyra High School	Box 130 Palmyra, NE 68418	780-5327	Merryman.chr@districtor1.net
Anita Lovell	Counselor, Behavioral Health Solutions	1700 14 th Avenue Nebraska City 68410	216-0561	anita@healthykidsomaha.com
Sarah Purcell	UNL Extension Educator	Box 160 Syracuse, NE 68446	269-2062	spurcell12@unl.edu
Traci Reuter	Healthy Communities Coord. St. Mary's Comm. Hospital	1314 3 rd Avenue Nebraska City 68410	873-8937	treuter@stez.org
Janet Johnson	LMHP, Choices Treatment Center	2737 N. 49 th Lincoln, NE 68504	476-2300	Choices934@windstream.net
Linda Unger	State of Nebraska Probation Officer	1021 Central Avenue Nebraska City 68410	873-9570	pounger@hotmail.com
Rena Pugh	Family Development Assoc. SE NE Community Action	200 N. 3 rd # 601 Nebraska City 68410	873-6459	secccomnbcy@windstream.net
Katy Bovick	After School Club Coord. People United For Families	Box 730, 920 Central Nebraska City 68410	873-6343	kbovick@windstream.net
Brooke Chaney	Growing Great Kids Coord. SE District Health Dept.	601 "J" Street Auburn, NE 68305	274-3993	brooke@sedhd.org
Bob Kohles	LMHP, Blue Valley Mental Health Services	1903 4 th Corso Nebraska City 68410	873-6374	bkohles@bvbh.net
Don Loseke	Special Services Director NE City Public Schools	215 N. 12 th Street Nebraska City 68410	873-6033	dloseke@esu4.org
Stacie Higgins	Program Coordinator TeamMates Mentoring Prog.	Box 730, 920 Central Nebraska City 68410	873-6343	teammates@alltel.net
Jacki Schmitz	People United For Families	Box 730, 920 Central Nebraska City 68410	873-6343	puffnc@alltel.net

III. Juvenile Justice System Analysis Tool:

The Partners for Otoe County Healthy Youth Committee met on September 18, 2008 to complete the Juvenile Justice System Analysis Tool for Otoe County under the direction of Julie Rogers, from the Juvenile Justice Institute at the University of Nebraska - Omaha. Preliminary recommendations were shared with committee members at subsequent committee meetings on October 23, 2008 and November 20, 2008. The Otoe County Juvenile Justice Systems Assessment was finalized on November 20, 2008 and appears in Appendix A of this document. Gaps were identified in six areas, summarized below:

1. *Geographic issues* – The rural nature of Otoe County requires residents to travel to Lincoln or Omaha in order to receive many types of services, creating time and transportation issues for accessing juvenile services.

2. *Limited staff/secure options* – Otoe County is geographically located in the middle of two staff/secure options in Lancaster and Sarpy Counties, approximately 45 minutes each direction, requiring probation/law enforcement staff to transport any time a circumstance arrives where a juvenile needs to be detained. A juvenile detoxification facility is also sometimes needed. Electronic monitoring is not currently available as a service for Otoe County probationers.
3. *Data and information management issues* – Data collection and information sharing is needed from one point of the system to the others in an efficient, accurate and timely manner.
4. *Expanded juvenile offender issues* – First time juvenile offenders are being sited at younger ages and for a wider variety of offences, creating the need to expand diversion programming. There are also times when the juvenile and/or their parents do not speak English as their first language.
5. *Alcohol use* – Alcohol use among juveniles remains a significant concern.
6. *Issues related to the HHS/OJS System* – Staff shortages, high turnover and changes in how cases are being approached create challenges for timely, appropriate services for juveniles and for developing relationships among HHS/OJS personnel and other system providers. Juveniles often have more service options available to them if placed with OJS rather than probation.

IV. Community Socio-Economics:

Otoe County is a county of 15,747 people located in Southeast Nebraska. The average resident age is 41 years old. The oldest and largest community in Otoe County is Nebraska City, located on the Missouri River approximately 50 miles south of Omaha and 50 miles east of Lincoln. Approximately half of the people who live in Otoe County are residents of Nebraska City, the other half are located in Dunbar, Syracuse, Unadilla and Palmyra along Highway # 2 or are residents of small agriculturally-based communities such as Avoca, Burr, Otoe, Paul, Lorton and Talmage. Otoe County is a high-intensity highway traffic area, with highway # 2 crossing Otoe County east to west and intersecting with Highway # 75 at Nebraska City, which runs north to south. Interstate # 29 runs north to south just three miles East of Otoe County along the Missouri River in Iowa.

In Otoe County 76% of children under 18 have all parents in the labor force, so the majority of parents in Otoe County require supervision for their children when they work. Some children are home alone after school, particularly in upper elementary and middle school. With a large number of manufacturing and service jobs in the community and many people working more than one job, workers are often scheduled at night or on weekends when children are out of school. Otoe County workers have an average 20-minute commute, and 31.8% commute outside the county for their jobs (RCEDC Website). Some families move to small towns for lower rent prices. The number of children living in homes with a single head of household nearly doubled from 349 in the 1990 Census to 638 in the 2000 Census, as did the percentage of children with single parents living in poverty (Kids Count in Nebraska, 2004.) The median household income of Otoe County is \$28,977 compared to a state median of \$29,308. The unemployment rate is approximately 3.5%. Although just 9% of the county population lives below the federal poverty level, among children, 36.12% of Nebraska City Public School children, 20.1% of Syracuse-

Dunbar-Avoca (S-D-A) school children and 20.8% of Palmyra District OR-1 children qualify for free/reduced price meals, compared to 36.42% statewide (NDE website).

There are three K-12 public school districts located in Otoe County. They are: Nebraska City Public Schools (1,362 students,) Syracuse-Dunbar-Avoca Schools (781 students,) and Palmyra-Bennett Schools (456 students.) There is also one parochial school, Lourdes Central Catholic Schools (331 students.) The Hispanic population is young and growing rapidly. In 2006-2007 there were 161 (13.7%) Hispanic children enrolled in Nebraska City Public Schools (NCPS), and 4.7% of students were English language learners. (NDE website)

Statistical Data for Otoe County

Gender & Ethnicity Otoe County 2002	Total Population of Grant Area		Total Juvenile Population of Grant Area (17 and under)	
	Number	% of total	Number	% of total
Male	7,786	49.0%	1,910	53.0%
Female	7,961	51.0%	1,721	47.0%
Hispanic	525	3.3%	218	6.3%
Non-Hispanic	15,222	96.7%	3,460	93.7%
White	15,558	98.7%	3,631	98.7%
Black	77	0.4%	21	0.5%
American Indian	59	0.3%	7	0.1%
Asian	53	0.3%	19	0.5%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	15,747	100.00%	3,678	100.0%

Source of Data: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations 2006, OJJDP website

V. Identified Priority Areas

The Partners for Otoe County Healthy Youth Committee identified six priority community problems at their meeting on November 20, 2008. Some are continuing priorities from the 2006-2008 plan and some are new priorities. Otoe County problem statements are listed below in no particular order of priority:

- 1. Underage youth in Otoe County are using alcohol at unacceptable rates that exceed state and national averages. (continuing priority)*
- 2. Children are exposed to and/or engage in high-risk behaviors at younger ages when compared to previous years. (new priority)*
- 3. Youth are often unsupervised when not in school. (continuing priority)*
- 4. Adequate financial and human resources for sustaining existing services are not available locally. (new priority)*

One priority from the 2006-2008 plan "Methamphetamine use is affecting health and safety of Otoe County youth" was discontinued. Two problems from the 2006-2008 plan – "People in Otoe County do not hold themselves or their children responsible for their actions" and "Accurate and timely information is not available from one point of the system to another." were

determined to be system gaps that are underlying causes contributing to the four problems listed above, rather than being the community problems.

The problem statements were developed after participants prioritized current service gaps identified in the Juvenile Justice System Analysis and in analysis of Otoe County's prevention system, which were ranked in order of priority. Gap areas below receiving a priority score of "1" were the lowest ranked priorities, each receiving one priority ranking. "Early intervention services", was the highest priority, ranked at "9", because it received nine priority rankings from committee members participating in the assessment process. All of the identified gaps appear below with the number of priority rankings received marked in front of each gap area:

Ranking	Prevention/Intervention System Gap Area
9	Early intervention services
7	Sustainability of existing resources
7	Responsive/Timely appropriate services for state wards
6	Substance abuse treatment that is affordable, accessible, age appropriate;
6	Mental health services that are affordable, accessible, right type and dosage, and people are willing to access
5	Appropriate services for younger juvenile offenders, those who have a wider variety of offenses, and those with limited English proficiency
5	After school programming that is accessible for all Otoe County children, K-8
4	Parenting resources and education and parents participating in what is currently available
3	Elementary guidance counselor for Nebraska City students
3	Communication and information sharing among system points, schools and service providers
1	Tracker services for probationers
1	Staffing/transportation/dollars for secure juvenile services and juvenile detoxification
1	Interpreters and translators
1	Appropriate/timely intervention for truancy (low number of cases, but action is needed when it happens)

Description and Status of Priority Community Problem Statements

Community Problem	Supporting Data – Why is this a Problem?	What Strategies Are Currently in Place for Addressing Community Problem?	What System Gaps Need to be Addressed in Order to Solve the Community Problem?
1. Underage youth in Otoe County are using alcohol at unacceptable rates that exceed state and national averages.	2007 NE Risk & Protective Factor Student Survey Data indicates 49% of Otoe County seniors used alcohol in the past 30 days, 33% were involved in binge drinking in the past 2 weeks and 28% used alcohol before driving in the past year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DARE Education All Stars taught in schools PACT group in place working on public policy changes to reduce the supply of alcohol to minors Beverage Server Training for employees of alcohol outlets Special enforcement to deter underage use/DUI/prosecution Sticker Shock campaigns “800” party tip line Operation Graduation Juvenile Diversion for 1st offense MIPs Safe Homes Parent Network Parent education activities PRIDE, STOP, PARTY – drug-free student organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People in Otoe County holding themselves and their children responsible for following the law and their behavior if the law is not followed Access to substance abuse treatment that is affordable, accessible, age appropriate Access to a detoxification facility for intoxicated youth when needed Appropriate services for younger juveniles who use alcohol/tobacco/drugs, and those with limited English proficiency Parent participation/consent for relevant prevention and early-intervention services currently available. Sustainability of existing resources Access to a full-time elementary guidance counselor in NE City
2. Children are exposed to and/or engage in high-risk behaviors at younger ages when compared to previous years.	2007 Data from Otoe County Court: 22 abuse/neglect petitions filed - Children involved in 12 abuse/ neglect petitions are waiting for CASA services; 157 juvenile filings in 2007 involving youth age 15 and under, compared to 103 in 2006; 45 out of the 157 law violations involve youth under the age of 15; Last data entered into Crime Commission database by Sheriff's Office in 8/05.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth Assistance Program – Blue Valley Student Assistance Teams at schools Community-Based Behavioral Health Services School Guidance Counselors School Improvement Plan projects in areas of improved reading and student behavior All Stars and Character Counts! Instruction in schools Growing Great Kids Study Buddies Tutoring TeamMates Mentoring Juvenile Diversion Program Expanded services for probationers Child Protective Services FYI Wraparound services for families with adolescents who have behavioral/mental health diagnosis Steering Committee formed to implement CASA Monthly 1184 Child Abuse Team Meetings Community Resource Directory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intervention/services at the earliest point possible Responsive/timely/appropriate services for state wards Appropriate services for juvenile offenders who: are younger, have a wider variety of offenses, and limited English proficiency Access to mental health & substance abuse services that are affordable, accessible, right type and dosage, that people are willing to access Communication and information sharing among system points, schools and service providers Data systems that are current, compatible and have the capacity to run queries at HHS, law enforcement agencies, county attorney, county court, probation, and diversion offices Appropriate/timely intervention for truancy People in Otoe County holding themselves and their children responsible for their actions

<p>3. Youth are often unsupervised when not in school.</p>	<p>76.3% of Otoe County youth (17 & under) have all parents in the workforce. (Kids Count Census Data Online 2007)</p> <p>Waiting lists at some day care centers, church after school programs, Kids Club</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-home daycare & daycare centers • Kids Club before/after school at Hayward Elementary in Nebraska City • Some churches offer after school programming on Wednesdays • Girl Scout, Boy Scout and 4-H programs • Free After School Clubs for middle school students at Syracuse and NE City middle schools • Parks & Recreation programs at Syracuse & NE City 4th-6th grade • Athletics for 7th-12th graders in all school systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of barriers to participation such as fees, transportation and responsibilities for the care of younger siblings that prevent some youth from participating in the day care, after school, athletic and recreational programs that are available • Sustainability of existing resources • Sufficient volunteers to serve all the youth who want to participate in the youth programming available in Otoe County
<p>4. Adequate financial and human resources for sustaining existing services are not available locally.</p>	<p>Although the number of youth served in Otoe Co. annually is increasing, NE Juvenile Justice Grant \$ are being reduced by \$17,875 from the 2007-2008 fiscal year to the 2008-2009 fiscal year and continue to step down 25% per year; \$100,000 in annual Substance Abuse Prevention Grant \$ will end in 2011; and Growing Great Kids Grant \$ will end in 2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$13,913 in Juvenile Service County Aid funds are available annually • United Way of Nebraska City funding provides some \$ for Study Buddies, TeamMates, After School Clubs, Growing Great Kids and local recreational programs • Funding from local foundations, including Steinhart, Nelson, Kropp and Wirth foundations provide funding to programs listed above. • Otoe County picked up Juvenile Diversion services as part of its general fund after the Juvenile Justice Grant ended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability of existing resources • Funding to start CASA services • Additional volunteers to allow more children to be served in mentoring and tutoring programs • Funding, if needed, to provide tracker services for probationers; Staffing/transportation for secure juvenile services and juvenile detoxification, Interpreters and translators

VI. Strategies

Goal: Reduce youth involvement in risk behaviors.

Objective 1: Reduce underage alcohol use in Otoe County.

Intervention	Strategies	Timelines	Responsibility	Resources Needed	Expected Results
Continuation Strategies	1. Continue DARE program in last year of elementary school at all Otoe County schools	Ongoing	NCPD; Lancaster Sheriff; NE State Patrol	Continued funding for materials	Improved relationships between law enforcement and youth
	2. Continue All Stars instruction in grades 7-8 at Nebraska City Middle Schools.	Ongoing	NCMS Health Teacher	Continuation funding for materials and evaluation beyond 2009	Age of 1 st use delayed, increased perception of risk/harm, inc. pro-social bonding, idealism
	3. Continue efforts of PRIDE, STOP and PARTY student organizations to reduce underage drinking.	Ongoing	Faculty sponsors at each school	Funding/opportunities for club activities and youth leadership development	Pro-social support for being alcohol free until 21 among participants = reduced 30-day use
	4. Continue special enforcement operations and Sticker Shock media campaign to deter incidents of Minor in Possession and Driving Under the Influence at peak times such as holidays.	Ongoing	NCPD, Otoe County Sheriff's Office, PACT Coordinator	Continued cooperation among partners; Continued Highway Safety Grant funds for personnel/ overtime	Reduced incidents of MIP/DUI, and injury accidents in Otoe County during special enforcement periods
	5. Continue Operation Graduation effort to deter underage drinking/ procurement over prom/ graduation season.	Ongoing	NCPD, Otoe County Sheriff's Office, PACT Coordinator, schools	Continued cooperation among partners & funding for personnel and postage	Reduced incidents of procuring alcohol for minors, MIP, DUI & injury accidents at graduation
	6. Continue Juvenile Diversion Program for first-time offenders of minor in possession and their parents	Ongoing	Juvenile Diversion Coord. Deputy County Attorney	Continuation funding for JD Coord. salary & volunteer presenters	Reduced recidivism among juvenile diversion participants
Policy/ Procedure Changes	PACT Committees will select at least one local policy, procedure or practice for change per year in the Nebraska City and Syracuse communities to reduce access of alcohol to minors using CMCA model.	Annually, 2009-2011	PACT Committee, PACT Coordinator, DFC Coordinator	Continuation funding for personnel & related expenses for coordination of program beyond 2011	Reduction in 30-day use rates, binge drinking and drinking and driving for Otoe County youth in grades 6-12
Training	1. Offer ongoing Responsible Beverage Server Training open to all liquor license holders and their employees.	2 times/ year 2009-2011	PACT Coordinator, NCPD	Funds for personnel & presenters 2009-2011	Increased percentage of alcohol vendors pass compliance checks
	2. Offer Youth Leadership Training so Otoe County youth can increase their leadership skills beginning in 2009.	Spring, 2009	P4OC Leadership Committee, DFC Coordinator	Volunteer presenters, Funds for facility rental, food, transportation 2009	Increased youth participation in leadership positions in the Otoe County community

Current Program Expansion	<p>1. Expand All Stars Program to grades 4 -9 at Syracuse and Palmyra-Bennett Schools by 2010.</p> <p>2. Expand compliance checks so that all liquor license holders in Otoe County are checked at least once annually by 2009.</p> <p>3. Continue to shift prosecution focus to adults who procure for minors, strengthen deterrent to procurement over the next 3 years--add ER staff to investigation loop.</p> <p>3. Increase the number of families participating in the Safe Homes Parent Network each year.</p> <p>4. Develop relevant diversion plans/curriculum for offenders under the age of 15 and those with limited English proficiency in 2009.</p>	<p>2009-2011 ongoing</p> <p>Annually, 2009-2011</p> <p>2009-2011 ongoing</p> <p>2009-2011 ongoing</p>	<p>SHS Health Teacher; Palmyra student advisors</p> <p>NCPD, Otoe County Sheriff's Office, PACT Coordinator</p> <p>Otoe County Attorney, NCPD, Otoe County Sheriff's Office, St. Mary's Hospital</p> <p>PACT Committee, schools in Otoe County</p> <p>Juvenile Diversion Coordinator</p>	<p>Continuation funding for materials and evaluation beyond 2009</p> <p>Youth volunteers, Continued Grant funds for personnel/ overtime</p> <p>Cooperation among partners involved</p> <p>Cooperation among partners involved, funds for postage, printing</p> <p>Availability of appropriate curriculum materials, presenters, translators, interpreters</p> <p>Support of law enforcement, Highway Safety Office, citizens</p>	<p>Age of 1st use delayed, increased perception of risk/harm, inc. pro-social bonding, idealism</p> <p>Increased percentage of alcohol vendors pass compliance checks</p> <p>Increase in the percentage of suppliers prosecuted for procuring when MIP incidents occur</p> <p>Increase in the number of families listed in and participating in network</p> <p>Reduced recidivism among juvenile diversion participants</p>
Program Development	<p>Implement "800" Party Tip Line to report or prevent underage drinking parties by 2009.</p>	<p>2009-2011 ongoing</p>	<p>PACT Coordinator</p>	<p>Reduced incidents of MIP, DUI, Reduced Binge Drinking rates among high school students</p>	

Objective 2: Children who are exposed to and/or engage in risk behaviors will receive appropriate services at the earliest point of intervention possible.

Intervention	Strategies	Timelines	Responsibility	Resources Needed	Expected Results
Continuation Strategies	<p>1. Continue student referrals to Youth Assistance Program as appropriate.</p> <p>2. Continue student referrals to school Student Assistance Teams as appropriate.</p> <p>3. Continue youth referrals to behavioral health/counseling services as appropriate.</p> <p>4. Continue referrals to FYI wraparound services as appropriate.</p> <p>5. Continue referrals to Growing Great Kids as appropriate.</p> <p>6. Continue referrals to Juvenile Diversion Program as appropriate.</p> <p>7. Continue prevention efforts such as Teammates and Study Buddies as appropriate.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Schools, community-based service providers</p> <p>Schools, community-based service providers</p> <p>Schools, community-based service providers</p> <p>Schools, community-based service providers</p> <p>NC Medical Clinic, community-based providers</p> <p>Otoe County Attorney</p> <p>Schools, PUFF, TeamMates of NC</p>	<p>Continuation funding for counseling services</p> <p>Continuation of SAT teams at schools</p> <p>Services continue to be available locally</p> <p>Continuation funding for wraparound services</p> <p>Sustainability funding beyond 3-year grant</p> <p>Continued personnel funding from county</p> <p>Local sustainability funding & volunteers to continue services</p>	<p>Children are connected with counseling services to meet needs</p> <p>Children are connected with appropriate services to meet needs</p> <p>Behavioral health of children improves</p> <p>Behavioral health of children improves</p> <p>Reduced child abuse, increased pro-social bonding with family</p> <p>Reduced recidivism among juvenile diversion participants</p> <p>Increased grades & attendance at school; reduced referrals for discipline</p>

	8. Continue monthly 1184 Child Abuse Team meetings.	Ongoing	Otoe County Attorney	Continued participation of key service providers	Expedient, appropriate resolution of child abuse/neglect allegations
Policy/ Procedure Changes	1. Implement procedure for tracking the number of unmet needs, such as mental health services, substance abuse services, tracker services, interpreter services, transportation and truancy intervention beginning in 2009.	January-December 2009	P4OC Healthy Youth Committee; Project Director	Time and cooperation of stakeholders involved in collecting accurate data	The number of children in Otoe County who need each service in a year will be identified
	2. Analyze data and seek out appropriate providers to close local service gaps by 2010.	January-December 2010	P4OC Healthy Youth Committee; Project Director	Time and effort of folks designated by committee	Service providers will be recruited to close service gaps
	3. Develop a process for increasing communication among service points when Family Resource Center opens in 2009 and make sure personnel at all points of the system are familiar with the resources currently available in the community.	April-December 2009	Family Resource Center Staff; P4OC Healthy Youth Committee	Time and cooperation of Family Resource Center staff, occupant agencies and other community service providers	More services will be ordered for children to meet their individual needs Children will receive services in a timely manner
Training	1. Make child abuse/neglect training available in Otoe County for those who provide services for children at least twice per year by 2009. 2. Update and distribute English/Spanish Community Resource Directory in 2009.	2 times/year 2009-2011	P4OC Healthy Families Committee	Funds for presenters personnel fees & 2009-2011	Service providers will recognize/report signs of abuse/neglect as appropriate
Current Program Expansion	1. Develop relevant diversion plans/curriculum for offenders under the age of 15 and those with limited English proficiency in 2009.	Spring, 2009	P4OC Marketing Committee	Funds for printing; Info from service providers	Increased use of services currently available in the community
Program Development	1. Implement Otoe County CASA program by 2009.	January-December 2009	Juvenile Diversion Coordinator; P4OC Healthy Youth Committee	Funding for materials, interpreters, translators	Reduced recidivism among juvenile diversion participants; Increased participation of parents
	2. Implement use of Service Point Software by organizations in Otoe County to facilitate communication among service providers and track unmet needs.	2009-2011 March 2009-March 2010	CASA Steering Committee; CASA Coordinator P4OC Basic Needs Committee; Family Resource Center Staff	Start-up funding to implement program Time and cooperation of key service providers to enter needed data into the system	Children involved in abuse/neglect will get safe, permanent homes; stay out of JJ system Increased use of services available in the community; Data collected to be used to fill system gaps in the community

Objective 3: Increase youth involvement in constructive, supervised activities in and out of school.

Intervention	Strategies	Timelines	Responsibility	Resources Needed	Expected Results
Continuation Strategies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue After School Clubs at the middle schools in Nebraska City and Syracuse. 2. Continue referrals to licensed day care providers as requested and appropriate. 3. Continue referrals to Kids Club as requested and appropriate. 4. Promote awareness of after school activities provided by park & recreation departments, schools at local churches. 	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Schools, People United For Families</p> <p>Community-based service providers</p> <p>Schools, community-based service providers</p> <p>City of Syracuse, City of Nebraska City, Schools, community-based service providers</p>	<p>Sustainability funding as ASC grant steps down</p> <p>Services continue to be available locally</p> <p>Service continues; Continuation funding</p> <p>Continuation funding to sustain local services; Coalition partners help promote activities</p>	<p>Increased student attendance; Children are engaged in supervised, constructive activities</p> <p>Children are in safe, supervised settings when parents are at work</p> <p>Student participation maximized; Children are engaged in supervised, constructive activities</p> <p>Student participation maximized; Children are engaged in supervised, constructive activities</p>
Policy/ Procedure Changes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement procedure for tracking waiting lists and the number of children who cannot access day care or supervised activities. 2. Analyze data and seek out potential providers to close local service gaps. 	<p>January-December 2010</p> <p>January-December 2011</p>	<p>P4OC Healthy Youth Committee; Project Director</p> <p>P4OC Healthy Youth Committee; Project Director</p>	<p>Time and cooperation of stakeholders involved in collecting accurate data</p> <p>Time and effort of folks designated by committee</p>	<p>The number of children in Otoe County who need each service in a year will be identified; barriers to participation will be identified</p> <p>Quality service providers will be recruited to close service gaps</p>
Current Program Expansion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explore the possibility of expanding After School Clubs in Syracuse to lower grades when the new middle school building opens. 	<p>August – December 2010</p>	<p>S-D-A Middle School Principal; After School Program Coordinator</p>	<p>Funding for club leaders, materials, operating expenses</p>	<p>More children involved in safe, supervised, constructive activities when parents are at work</p>

**Objective 4: Develop human and financial resources for sustaining a comprehensive juvenile service system in Otoe County.
of intervention possible.**

Intervention	Strategies	Timelines	Responsibility	Resources Needed	Expected Results
Continuation Strategies	1. Continue to apply for funds from the United Way of Nebraska City to sustain local prevention services.	Ongoing	Community-based service providers	People to write proposals, program volunteers & funds available at United Way	Local prevention services currently in place sustained at current scale
	2. Continue to apply to local foundations to sustain local prevention services.	Ongoing	Community-based service providers and schools	People to write grants, volunteers & local foundation \$ available	Local prevention services currently in place sustained at current scale
	3. Continue to apply for Juvenile Service County Aid funds to sustain juvenile justice efforts in Otoe County.	Ongoing	Project Director; Otoe County Commissioners	Project Director time to coordinate and manage grant	Local juvenile services currently in place sustained at current scale; grant managed appropriately
Policy/ Procedure Changes	1. Determine appropriate committee structure and responsibility centers for sustaining strategies initiated through P4OC.	March-December 2009	P4OC Coordinating Committee	Time and effort of committee members	Increased clarity of coalition vs provider roles/responsibilities
Training	1. Train leaders of prevention program providers in sustainability strategies.	June – December 2009	Project Director; P4OC Coordinating Committee	Funds for presenter fees/travel & personnel to participate	Training participants will increase revenue generated through sustainability efforts after training
Current Program Expansion	1. Update P4OC's sustainability plan so that existing services/strategies are sustained through 2011. 2. Develop the financial resources to implement the Otoe County CASA program by 2009.	March-December 2009 January-December 2009	Project Director; P4OC Coordinating Committee CASA Steering Committee. Project Director	Time and effort of committee members, project director Time and effort of committee members, project director	Plan developed for sustaining P4OC and its strategies that need sustaining CASA program implemented in accordance with planned timelines
Program Development	1. Complete development plans to fund any of the unmet needs determined to be a priority by the coalition after data analysis in 2010. (see Objective 2, B, 2 and Objective 2, B, 2)	2010-2011	Healthy Youth Committee	Start-up funding to implement any programs identified in Objective 2 for closing service gaps	Reduced barriers to participation in services recommended for juvenile offenders; reduction in local service gaps at the time of the next system assessment

RECEIVED

DEC 29 2008

Juvenile Justice System Analysis Tool
October 2008

NEBRASKA COMMISSION ON
LAW ENFORCEMENT AND
CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Otoe County Juvenile Justice System Analysis Tool

Partners for Otoe County Healthy Youth Committee met to discuss the Juvenile Justice System Analysis tool to inform the completion of Otoe County's Juvenile Services Comprehensive Plan for 2009-2011. Julie Rogers of the Juvenile Justice Institute led the discussion.

Those present included individuals representing the Otoe County Attorney's office, People United For Families, District OR-1 Schools, Otoe County Juvenile Diversion, SENCA, Behavioral Health Solutions, and Probation. Those not present were given the opportunity to contribute.

The following was created by the meeting facilitator based on discussion of the juvenile justice professionals present:

Community Planning Decision Point Analysis

Otoe County Data

Data Points	Total Population	Juvenile Population
Total Population	15,747	1,754
Male	7,786	942
Female	7,961	812
White	15,558	1,732
Black/African American	77	11
Asian	53	7
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	Not reported	Not reported
American Indian	59	4
Hispanic	525	91
Juveniles Arrested	N/a	157
Juveniles Detained	N/a	17
Juveniles Prosecuted	N/a	118
Juveniles Placed in Diversion	N/a	39
Number of Juveniles Adjudicated	N/a	128
YRTC-Kearney commitments	N/a	1
YRTC-Geneva commitments	N/a	1

Sources:

*Demographic data source - OJJDP website "Easy Access to Juvenile Populations, 2006 (Juvenile Population Ages 10-17)
**Juveniles Arrested/Detained/Prosecuted/Adjudicated/Diversion - Otoe County Attorney's Office - 2007

NEBRASKA CRIME COMMISSION
YEAR(s): 2007
SEX: Male Female Unknown
COUNTY: OTTOE County
Juvenile Court Reporting
Result Set: 136 records found

Referral Description	Total	White	Black	Native American	Mexican American	Asian	Other/Unknown	Percent of Total
• MAJOR OFFENSES								
Murder	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Manslaughter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Assault-1st/2nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Assault-3rd	10	7	0	0	0	0	3	7.35%
Sexual Assault-1st	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Sexual Assault-2nd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Robbery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Drug-Felony	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Drug-Misdemeanor	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.74%
Arson-Felony	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Arson-Misdemeanor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Burglary	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.74%
Unauth Use Motor Vehicle	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Theft > \$1500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Theft < \$1500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Theft < \$500	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.47%
Theft < \$200	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	2.94%
Crim Mischief-Fel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Crim Mischief-Misd	5	2	0	0	0	0	3	3.68%
Major Trespass	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.47%
Forgery-Felony	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Forgery-Misd - Major	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Weapon-Felony - Major	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Weapon-Misd	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
DUI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Disturbing Peace	9	7	0	0	0	0	2	6.62%
Other Felony	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
Other Misdemeanor	44	26	1	0	2	0	15	32.35%
Totals For All Major Offenses	78	46	1	0	2	0	29	57.35%

• MINOR OFFENSES									
<u>Running Away</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	
<u>Truancy</u>	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	4.41%	
<u>Curfew</u>	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	2.21%	
<u>Ungov Behavior</u>	5	3	0	0	0	0	2	3.68%	
<u>Poss Alcohol</u>	19	17	0	0	1	0	1	13.97%	
<u>Other Status</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	
Totals For All Minor Offenses	33	23	0	0	1	0	9	24.26%	
• NON OFFENSES									
<u>Neglect</u>	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	2.21%	
<u>Dependent</u>	5	1	0	0	0	0	4	3.68%	
Totals For All Non Offenses	8	1	0	0	1	0	6	5.88%	
• UNKNOWN OFFENSES									
<u>Other/Unknown</u>	17	10	0	0	0	0	7	12.50%	
Totals For All Unknown Offenses	17	10	0	0	0	0	7	12.50%	
Totals All Offenses	136	80	1	0	4	0	51	100.00%	

System Decision Point:

Arrest/Citation

Police/Law Enforcement

Decision: *Whether an information report should be filed, or what offense, if any, with which juvenile should be cited or arrested*

Formal Determining Factors

- Sufficient factual basis to believe offense committed
- Underlying support for a particular offense

Informal Determining Factors

- Law enforcement records every contact
- Youth and/or youth's families perceived low status
- Cooperation between law enforcement
- Generational issues are affecting how juveniles are perceived

Comments: The Sheriff's office has not reported Crime Commission data for the previous 16 months, leaving a gap in current data.

Decision: *Whether to cite or arrest juvenile for juvenile or adult*

Formal Determining Factors

- Criteria set forth in Neb. Rev. Stat. § 43-276, i.e. seriousness of offense, age.

Informal Determining Factors

- If youth is under HHS or on probation, law enforcement is contacting respective agency to make determination
- Contacts tracked by law enforcement

Decision: *Whether to take juvenile into custody or to cite and release
(NRS § 43-248(1), (2); § 43-250(1), (2), (3))*

Formal Determining Factors

- As stated in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- Immediate risk to juvenile
- Immediate/short term risk to public
- Seriousness of perceived offense
- Extent parent/responsible adult available

System Decision Point:

Initial Detention

State of Nebraska Probation

Decision: *Whether juvenile should be detained or released*

Formal Determining Factors

- Risk assessment outcome
- Accessibility of placement options:
parents/guardians, emergency shelter, staff
secure facility, secure detention facility

Informal Determining Factors

- Detention options in Sarpy and Lancaster
Counties, Madison County if needed

Discussion Notes:

- Use of electronic monitoring at this point is not seen as needed. There was general consensus that juveniles are being appropriately detained.
- Initial detention is the county's cost—approximately \$240 per day. After adjudication, any detention is the state's cost.
- A detention center established in Otoe County would be ideal.

System Decision Point:

Charge Juvenile

County Attorney

Decision: *Whether to prosecute juvenile*

Formal Determining Factors

- Sufficient evidence to support charge
- Factors under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 43-276

Informal Determining Factors

- Otoe County's diversion program
eligibility and acceptance

Discussion Notes:

- There has been a change in the Otoe County Attorney twice in the past three years.
- The number of juvenile prosecutions has significantly increased.
- During this time there has been a spike in the serious crimes committed by juveniles and more disciplinary issues in the schools. This is thought to be because of generational, "ripple effect" problems of marginalized, lower socio-economic level families.

Decision: *Whether youth should be prosecuted as juvenile or adult*

Formal Determining Factors

- Seriousness of offense
- Factors under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 43-276

Informal Determining Factors

- Knowing local judge's approach

Decision: *Offense for which juvenile should be charged*

Formal Determining Factors

- Factors under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 43-276

Informal Determining Factors

System Decision Point:

Pre-Adjudication Detention

Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether juvenile detained at the time of citation/arrest should continue in detention or out-of-home placement pending adjudication*

Formal Determining Factors

- Whether there is an "immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of such juvenile"
- Whether there is an "immediate and urgent necessity for the protection of . . . the person or property of
- Whether the juvenile is likely to flee the jurisdiction of the court

Informal Determining Factors

- Least restrictive means available for the safety of the child

Discussion Notes:

- Juveniles are being detained more frequently now than 3 years ago.
- Those that are detained usually remain in detention because of such severe problems, especially with anger.
- It is estimated that of those that are detained, some go back to family and around 25% are placed with HHS.

System Decision Point: **Probable Cause Hearing**
Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether State can show that probable cause exists that juvenile is within the jurisdiction of the court*

Formal Determining Factors

- Neb. Rev. Stat. §43-256

Informal Determining Factors

Discussion Notes:

- Detention hearings are rarely held in Otoe County

System Decision Point: **Competency Evaluation**
Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether juvenile is competent to participate in the proceedings*

Formal Determining Factors

- Neb. Rev. Stat. §43-258 (1(b))

Informal Determining Factors

Decision: *Whether juvenile is "responsible" for his/her acts*

Formal Determining Factors

- "Complete evaluation of the juvenile including any authorized area of inquiry requested by the court."
- Opinion of physician, surgeon, psychiatrist, community mental health program, psychologist

Informal Determining Factors

Discussion Notes:

- Competency objections have not come up in Otoe County in the recent past

System Decision Point:

Adjudication

Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether the juvenile is, beyond a reasonable doubt, "a person described by § 43-247"*

Formal Determining Factors

- Legal sufficiency of evidence presented during adjudication hearing
- Whether juvenile admits the allegations of the petition (or, "pleads to the charges")
- Residency
- Age

Informal Determining Factors

Decision: *Whether to order probation to conduct a PDI (Pre-Disposition Investigation) statutory authority unclear--see also: § 29-2261 (2)*

Formal Determining Factors

Informal Determining Factors

Discussion Notes:

- Even if the judge does not order a PDI, some type of evaluation is usually ordered
- If the offense is a true "first" for the juvenile, the judge consistently orders a PDI

Decision: *Whether to order OJS (Office of Juvenile Services) evaluation*

Formal Determining Factors

- NRS § 29-2204 (3): "Prior to making a disposition which commits the juvenile to the Office of Juvenile Services, the court shall order the juvenile to be evaluated by the office if the juvenile has not had an evaluation within the past twelve months.

Informal Determining Factors

- If PDI does not give the information needed for disposition an OJS evaluation may be ordered
- If placement is outside the home a residential evaluation will be ordered -- for in home placement, a community evaluation will be ordered

Decision: *Whether to order a PDI and an OJS Evaluation*

Formal Determining Factors

Informal Determining Factors

- Presumably supplement each other
- Uncertainty about whether probation or commitment to OJS is in the juvenile's best interest

System Decision Point:

Disposition

Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether to place juvenile on probation*

Formal Determining Factors

Informal Determining Factors

- An individualized approach to each case
- Informal probation to the court is common for first time, minor offenses
- Most status offense cases are disposed of through HHS for services

Discussion Notes:

- If an informal probation is not satisfied, the judge might order a PDI or OJS evaluation

Decision: *Whether to commit juvenile to the Office of Juvenile Services (OJS)*

Formal Determining Factors

Informal Determining Factors

- Whether juvenile is at least twelve years of age
- Judge will order a juvenile a commitment to OJS to offer in-home services
- No positive view of YRTC

Discussion Notes:

- OJS has a "tracker" and Probation does not
- If a juvenile is in need of psychiatric services, placement with OJS is ordered in order to access such services; Probation has less access to services
- More services can be provided through placement with HHS/OJS, giving them the responsibility of supervision and accessible treatment or rehabilitation options for the youth.
- HHS has been attempting to terminate cases as quickly as possible and most of the time this is premature, before all needed services can be received. The judge is very good about determining the termination of a case based on the needs of the individual juvenile, and whether appropriate services were received, and not based solely on a recommendation from HHS.

Decision: *Whether to place juvenile on probation and commit juvenile to HHS or OJS*

Formal Determining Factors

- As outlined in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- Judge does not assign dual supervision cases
- Whether certain services are available through OJS or probation

Discussion Notes:

- Services specifically geared towards juveniles are scarce in Otoe County. For example, intensive outpatient treatment is not available for juveniles, so juveniles are sent to Omaha or Lincoln, and then transportation becomes an issue. NA and AA meetings are adult focused.
- Not as many services can be accessed through Probation as through OJS. If Probation exhausts all services options available, and the juvenile is in need of further programming, Probation asks for probation to be revoked and the juvenile committed to OJS, so appropriate services become available and may be paid for (through Magellen).
- Frustration is high with OJS. Staffing is perpetually low, turnover is very frequent. This results in lack of continuity and difficulty in developing relationships. Whereas Probation communicates with law enforcement about a juvenile's probation orders, OJS does not communicate with law enforcement, especially about status and restrictions such as curfew.

System Decision Point:

Administrative Sanctions

Probation

Decision: *Whether to impose administrative sanctions*

Formal Determining Factors

- Probation officer has reasonable cause to believe that probationer has committed or is about to commit a substance abuse violation or a non criminal violation
- Substance abuse violation refers to a positive test for drug or alcohol use, failure to report for such a test or failure to comply with substance abuse evaluations or treatment

Informal Determining Factors

System Decision Point:

Motion To Revoke Probation
County Attorney

Decision: *Whether to file a motion to revoke probation*

Formal Determining Factors

- As outlined in statute

Informal Determining Factors

- If a motion to revoke is requested by Probation, it is filed

System Decision Point:

Modification/Revocation of Probation
Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether to modify or revoke probation*

Formal Determining Factors

Informal Determining Factors

- Case-by-case determination

System Decision Point:

Setting Aside Adjudication
Juvenile Court Judge

Decision: *Whether juvenile has satisfactorily completed his or her probation and supervision or treatment program of his or her commitment*

Formal Determining Factors

- Juvenile's post-adjudication behavior and response to treatment and rehabilitation programs
- Whether setting aside adjudication will depreciate seriousness of juvenile's conduct or promote disrespect for the law
- Whether failure to set aside adjudication may result in disabilities disproportionate to the conduct upon which the adjudication was based

Informal Determining Factors

- Recommendations made by Probation or OJS

Discussion Notes:

- Very few adjudications are set aside

Decision: *Whether juvenile should be discharged from custody and supervision of OJS*

Formal Determining Factors

- Presumably same as those for probation

Informal Determining Factors

- OJS requests termination at a review hearing

Discussion Notes:

- As outlined in statute, OJS is given the discretion to release juveniles, but they very rarely release them on their own—they request the judge to order termination

Summary:

Otoe County juvenile justice professionals met to discuss the community planning tool for the juvenile comprehensive plan. Otoe County has a very active and committed group to address juvenile justice issues which has led to creativity in finding resources in and outside the community to deal with such issues.

Otoe County has continued to make progress in addressing priorities by continually re-evaluating and implementing new ideas. For example, the Family Resources Center is in the works and will be completed soon, allowing justice and service professional to gain a better understanding of one another's role in serving youth and their families, by working together to minimize coordination conflicts and improve the match between juveniles and the services needed. Also, a CASA program is being established to advance advocacy in the court system for juveniles in Otoe County.

- 1) One significant obstacle is the rural nature of the county. Numbers do not always justify specific programming for juveniles, so youth must access available services in the Omaha and Lincoln areas. Transportation then becomes the solution—how to get the families to services outside of Otoe County. Otoe County continues to look for new ways to address the challenges of a juvenile justice system in rural Nebraska.
- 2) Data collection and management is an ongoing problem—needing to be obtained in a more efficient, accurate and timely manner. Justice and service professionals currently produce data in isolation of each other. An improved way of collecting and managing data will assist in proper evaluation of programming and for grant writing purposes to obtain funds to support and/or implement new programs.
 - a. The Nebraska Crime Commission can be relied upon for some data, but currently the Otoe County Sheriff's office is not reporting their numbers to the Crime Commission, so such data becomes unreliable when such an important data piece is missing.
 - b. Benefits to establishing a statewide diversion data system include knowing whether individual juveniles are, or have been, on diversion in another county in Nebraska. If such system is implemented, safeguards would need to be implemented so information is not misused.
- 3) Otoe County is geographically in the middle of two staff/secure options in Lancaster and Sarpy Counties, approximately 45 minutes in each direction. The only option for law enforcement, probation, and the courts is for a juvenile to be left at a facility or released home to a parent/guardian. Though electronic monitoring was not seen as needed at this point, it should be kept in mind if data shows a need in lieu of detention, especially since more juveniles are being detained. Creating a place in Otoe County, or in the region, to detain juveniles would be ideal, though is not currently a feasible idea because the numbers would not justify such action becoming a priority.
 - a. Related to detention facilities is the need for a juvenile detoxification facility when a juvenile is too severely under the influence to be held at a juvenile detention center. Again, based on numbers, when this becomes a priority, a regional "juvenile detox center" may be the solution.

- 4) When the Diversion Program in Otoe County was originally created, it was focused on offenders charged with possession of alcohol, as that was the main issue of the participants. Now juveniles coming into the program have been charged with a whole array of offenses. Programming should be expanded within Diversion to address other issues beyond possession of alcohol. Diversion and the County Attorney's office shall work together on processes when upon intake, a juvenile is deemed high risk and not amenable to services Diversion offers.
- 5) Alcohol use among juveniles remains a significant concern. A coordinated response is needed, and with the Partners for Otoe County Community Coalition, Otoe County is poised to manage such efforts in the most effective way possible.
- 6) There is high frustration with HHS—OJS.
 - a. Though the YLS/CMI is being used across agencies, it is felt the OJS tries to minimize issues.
 - b. OJS, because of political pressures, attempts to terminate cases prematurely.
 - c. There is high turnover within OJS, therefore relationships are difficult to develop. OJS always seems to be short-staffed.
 - d. OJS has more services to offer juveniles than Probation. This sometimes results in juveniles being placed with OJS instead of put on Probation to access programming unavailable under the Probation system.